



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

stitutional limitation is applicable. The principal case illustrates another effective means of evading a constitutional limitation—by amendment to the constitution validating a void debt.

PROCESS—JURISDICTION OVER A FOREIGN CORPORATION IN ACTIONS ARISING OUTSIDE THE STATE.—The plaintiff, a resident of New York, sued the defendant corporation in the New York court upon a contract made in Pennsylvania, and served process upon an agent designated by the defendant as “a person upon whom process against the corporation may be served within the state.” The defendant was engaged in business within the state of New York and conceded the agency of the person upon whom process was served, but contended that the agency to receive service must be confined to actions which arose out of business transactions in New York. This position was sustained by the Supreme Court and the Appellate Division, but on appeal to the Court of Appeals the order was reversed, and it was *held* that the appointment of the agent to receive service of process was for any action which under the laws of the state might be brought against a foreign corporation. *Bagdon v. Philadelphia and Reading Coal and Iron Company*, (N. Y. 1916), 111 N. E. 1075.

The District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California reached a contrary conclusion in a case, decided in October, 1915, which was not cited in the opinion of the New York court. *Fry v. Denver & R. G. R. Co.*, 226 Fed. 893, commented upon *supra*, page 333. The court in this latter case relied upon two decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, which held that in a suit against a foreign corporation that has not appointed a resident agent to receive service of process, service upon a person designated by the statute providing for such service is not sufficient to give the court jurisdiction over a cause of action arising in another state. *Old Wayne Life Assn. v. McDonough*, 204 U. S. 8; *Simon v. Southern Railway Co.*, 236 U. S. 115, noted in 13 MICH. L. REV. 520. These two cases were urged upon the New York court as conclusive authority for the position it advanced, but the court distinguished them from the case before it, where the corporation itself appointed the agent to receive service, and declined to follow them. The reasoning of the court is similar to that outlined in the criticism of the *Fry* case, *supra*, page 333.

PUBLIC OFFICERS—CONTRACTUAL RIGHT TO SALARY.—Action was brought by several policemen against the City of Cleveland to recover for their salaries as police officers for the time during which they had been wrongfully ousted from office. Other policemen had been appointed in their stead during the interval and had drawn substantially the same salary. *Held*, where a policeman has been wrongfully dismissed from office, he may recover his salary from the city for the period of the wrongful ouster, less the amount otherwise earned by him, though another has been employed in his place and has been paid the salary thereof. *City of Cleveland v. Luttner*, (Ohio 1916) 111 N. E. 280.

In arriving at this conclusion the majority of the court took the view that a contract existed between the officer and the public, for the breach of which the former should have the same remedy as a private servant for any